

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, and 13 were rejected and claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter of claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20. By this Response, claims 9 and 18 have been amended. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-20 will remain pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-20 are respectively requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 18-20 were-rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that: "Claim 18 is vague and indefinite because 'coupling the first pressure washing wand to a liquid storage tank; coupling the second pressure washing wand to a pump' renders the claim unclear. According to previous claims, 'the second wand couples to the storage tank and the first wand couples to the pump.' Correction is required."

By this response, claim 18 has been amended in light of the Examiner's comments. It is believed that the amendment to claim 18 renders moot the rejection of claims 18-20 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wemmer, U.S. Patent No. 4, 341, 350. Claims 1, 9, and 18 are independent claims. By this response, claim 9 has been amended to correct a

typographical error. Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 11 and 13 depend from independent claim 9. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 18 are not anticipated because the Wemmer reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

For example, one of the recited features of independent claim 1 that is not disclosed by the Wemmer reference is "a storage tank operable to store a second liquid and to *pressurize* the second liquid *within the storage tank* to produce a flow of second fluid from the storage tank (emphasis added)." In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that: "Wemmer teaches a pressure washing system comprising a pump (14) operable to produce a flow of a first liquid, and operable connected with a storage tank to store a second liquid (27) and to *pressurize* the second liquid within the storage tank to produce a flow of a second liquid from the storage tank."

The Wemmer reference does disclose a container 27. However, in contrast to the Examiner's assertion, the container 27 of Wemmer does not *pressurize* the second liquid. Rather than pressuring the container 27 to produce a flow of liquid from the container 27, an eductor 23 is used to produce a *suction force* sufficient to draw chemical concentrate from the container 27 through a pick-up tube 25 extending from inside the container 27 to the eductor 23. *See* Wemmer, col. 7, lines 40-46; *see also* col. 3, lines 52-57 and col. 4, lines 32-36. Thus, in order to enable the eductor 23 to produce the suction force, the container 27 is *vented to ambient pressure*, not *pressurized*. *See* Wemmer, col. 7, line 22. In fact, the Wemmer reference discloses that the container 27 may be a metal or plastic bucket. *See* Wemmer, col. 7, lines 25-32. Obviously, a bucket is not operable to be *pressurized*. In addition, if the container 27 were not vented to the atmosphere, a vacuum

would be created within the container 27 as the chemical concentrate was removed. Eventually, this vacuum would prevent flow of the chemical concentrate from the container 27. Thus, the container 27 of Wemmer is clearly not operable to be pressurized. Therefore, the Wemmer reference does not disclose “a storage tank operable to store a second liquid and to *pressurize* the second liquid *within the storage tank* to produce a flow of second fluid from the storage tank,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the Wemmer reference. Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 1 and are, therefore, also not anticipated by the Wemmer reference.

Similarly, the Wemmer reference does not disclose “a storage tank operable to store a liquid *under pressure*,” as recited in independent claim 9, and “coupling the second pressure washing wand to *a liquid storage tank operable to pressurize a second liquid disposed therein*,” as recited in independent claim 18 (emphasis added). Accordingly, independent claims 9 and 18 also are not anticipated by the Wemmer reference. Claims 11 and 13 depend from independent claim 9 and are, therefore, also not anticipated by the Wemmer reference.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 18 are allowable over the Wemmer reference. Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

As noted above, claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. - Applicant once again would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter of claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20.


Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 depend from independent claims 1, 9, and 18, respectively. For the reasons provided above, claims 1, 9, and 18 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 22, 2005



David K. Williams
#19 12290 Highway 181 South
San Antonio, TX 78223
(210) 633-3202